Remarks

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 15-17 have been withdrawn. Claims 5 and 13 have been amended. Claim 14 has been canceled. New claims 18-24 have been added.

Objections - Minor Informalities

Applicants have herewith amended the title of the invention such that it is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are drawn. The spelling of actinonin has been corrected via the replacement Figure 3 enclosed herewith. Likewise, the spelling of the term "Figure" is corrected on the enclosed replacement sheets. Applicant therefore believes the minor informalities have been addressed.

Rejections - 35 USC 112, 2nd

Applicant has canceled claim 14 and amended claim 5 to remove the terms "preferably", "in particular", and "for example". Applicants believe cancellation of claim 14 and presentation of new claims 18-24 clarifies what is meant by the term "derivative" where that term still appears in the claims. Removal of the stated rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 USC 112, 1st

Claims 5 and 13-14 have been rejected based on the contention that they fail to comply with the enablement requirement.

In response, Applicants have herewith amended claims 5 and 13 to remove reference to "prevention" and to specify that the therapeutic aspect of the invention is drawn to inhibition of activation, DNA synthesis and proliferation of human fibroblasts. Applicants have also amended the claims to specify that the method is directed to therapy of an individual in need of treatment. Thus, since the claims no longer refer to prevention, Applicants courteously submit that the Examiner's contention that there is no guidance as to how to determine individuals who are susceptible to the recited diseases (and therefore would be targeted for *prevention*) has been rendered moot, since the method is performed to provide a therapy to individuals who can be readily determined to have any of the recited diseases by one skilled in the art. Further, claim 13 specifies that the diseases in question relate to hyperproliferation and changed differentiation

states of fibroblasts. Thus, the claimed method is expressly drawn to therapy of such diseases. Removal of the stated rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 13-14 have also been rejected based on the contention that they fail to comply with the written description requirement.

In response, Applicants emphasize at the outset that the instant application does not claim new APN or DP IV inhibitors. Rather, Applicants have discovered a new use for known inhibitors of APN and DP IV, namely, for treating dermatological diseases, the etiology of which are associated with a hyperproliferation of fibroblasts. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to U.S. Patent No. 6,303,661, which recites in its claims "a therapeutically effective amount of at least one inhibitor of Dipeptidyl Peptidase (DP IV) or of DP IV-like enzyme activity." Further, the claims have been amended to limit what is meant by derivatives where that term is still recited in the claims. Thus, it is submitted that the U.S. Patent Office has already acknowledged that one skilled in the art would recognize the scope of the instant claims insofar as they pertain to the recited genus of DP IV inhibitors.

In connection with inhibitors of APN, Applicant's point out the claims have been amended to limit what is meant by derivatives where that term is still recited in the claims. Further, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the enclosed reference of Wenfang Xu and Qianbin Li, (2005, 5, 000-000) *Progress in the Development of Aminopeptidase N (APN/CD13) Inhibitors*, Curr. Med. Chem. - Anti-Cancer Agents. This article and the references cited therein illustrate that, in addition to the species of APN already recited in the instant application, there are many species of APN inhibitor known in the art such that the recited genus is readily recognizable to one skilled in the art. In this regard, Applicants respectfully point out that both the MPEP (in section 2163) and the Federal Circuit indicate that information which is well known in the art need not be described in detail in the specification. (See Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., 802 F.2d 1367, 1379-80, 231 USPQ 81, 90 (Fed. Cir. 1986)). Therefore, Applicants submit that the instant disclosure fully complies with the written description requirement such that one skilled in the art would conclude that Applicants were in possession of the recited genus of APN inhibitors commensurate with the full scope of the claims. Removal of the stated rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 USC 102(b)

The claims stand rejected over Ansorge (WO 02/053170) based on the contention that this reference anticipates the instant claims.

In response, Applicants point out that since prevention is no longer recited in the instant claims, it is believed the cited reference does not disclose the presently claimed method. Removal of the stated rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants request a three-month extension of time to file this response. A check for the required fee is enclosed. Any additional fees due may be charged (or any overpayment credited) to Deposit Account no. 08-2442.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Lopinski

By: _____

John D. Lopinski, Reg. No. 50,486

HODGSON RUSS LLP
The Guaranty Building
140 Pearl Street, Suite 100
Buffalo, NY 14202-4040
Tel. 716-848-1628
Dated: September 19, 2008

013183/00055 BFLODOCS 2413994v1